

VITAL SPEECHES

— OF THE DAY —

VOL. XXV, No. 2
35 cents per copy

NOVEMBER 1, 1958

TWICE A MONTH
\$7.00 A YEAR

Our Patriotic Debt to Our Dead

LET US BE "WORKERS FOR PEACE" NOT PACIFISTS

Investment in Human Resources

WE MUST SPEND SUBSTANTIALLY MORE FOR EDUCATION
AND SPEND IT WISELY

The American Family of Nations

IT IS GOOD BUSINESS TO DEVELOP LATIN AMERICA

The Unity That Is Our Strength

OUR COMMON ALLEGIANCE

Free World Progress

AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITIES

Price and The Public Interest

A CAMPAIGN OF CALUMNY PEDDLED FROM HIGH PLACES

The Leftward March of The Congress

SOCIALISM PREFERRED

More Activity in Political Realms

A BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITY

Partners in Progress

FARMERS ARE BUSINESSMEN

"U. S. Intelligence"

PRINCIPAL FOCUS UPON INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

Parole Better Protects Society

THE VALUE AND NATURE OF PAROLE

By John J. Wright

Bishop of Worcester, Mass.—Page 34

By H. G. Rickover

Rear Admiral, U. S. Navy—Page 36

By Pedro Beltran

Publisher of *La Prensa*, Lima, Peru—Page 42

By William Hamilton

Postmaster General, Canada—Page 40

By Philip Cortney

President, Coty, Inc.—Page 45

By Roger M. Blough

Chairman, U. S. Steel Corp.—Page 54

By Strom Thurmond

Senator from South Carolina—Page 48

By Robert L. L. McCormick

President, McCormick Associates, Inc.—Page 58

By Ezra Taft Benson

Secretary of Agriculture, U. S.—Page 51

By C. P. Cabell

Deputy Director of Central Intelligence—Page 60

By George J. Reed

Chairman, U. S. Board of Parole—Page 62

IMPARTIAL

CONSTRUCTIVE

AUTHENTIC

THE BEST THOUGHT OF THE BEST MINDS ON CURRENT NATIONAL QUESTIONS

The Leftward March of The Congress

SOCIALISM PREFERRED

By STROM THURMOND, *Senator from South Carolina*

Delivered before the Young Executives Club, Rock Hill, S. C., October 9, 1958

I WANT TO SPEAK to you today on a subject that has caused me grave concern in recent years, especially so during the two years of the 85th Congress which came to a close in August. I have been concerned about this matter because I believe in Americanism and the principles of constitutional government, which in the past have made it possible for this country to be the greatest nation on earth. I cherish freedom of initiative and our free enterprise system because these great principles have contributed so invaluable to the remarkable progress which our country has been able to make in such a short period of time.

Once a man's initiative is stifled by the deceptively alluring philosophy of "Security from the cradle to the grave," which is inevitably accompanied by a loss of freedom and liberty, all progress except in the realm of materialism is precluded—and even material progress is then possible only under the tyranny of dictatorship or anarchism.

Recent events clearly indicate that our Federal Government is striding more rapidly toward a socialistic welfare state than ever before. The actions taken in the legislative halls of the 85th Congress justifies the statement that in Congress, as well as in the Supreme Court, Socialism is preferred.

An outstanding example of the left-wing preferences of Congress is the recently considered, but fortunately vetoed, Area Redevelopment Bill. This measure, which passed both Houses of Congress, would have authorized funds for the actual placement of industry in economically depressed areas. Included in the bill was an authorization for 75 million dollars for grants to cover such items as subsistence payments to persons undergoing retraining for industries relocated and placed with Government funds. Naturally, the bill involved the creation of a new federal agency to add to the hundreds of other Government bureaus now in existence.

Another example of the same type of legislation was the Community Facilities Bill which passed the Senate but was fortunately killed in the House. This proposed legislation would have, in effect, substituted the Federal Government for private lending agencies at the State and municipal government levels for the financing of public works. By public works, I do not mean water and sewer projects, for the bill was almost unlimited as to the facilities for which it would apply. This was one of numerous bills designed to prime the economic pump and thereby combat the recession, but like most of the others, it could have no immediate effect and was useless as an anti-recession device.

Finance was not the only field in which the Congress dealt favorably with socialistic legislation. Nor was the Court the only branch of the Federal Government which interposed itself into the field of education.

Congress enacted over my vigorous objections a law authorizing a program of general Federal aid to education. Advocates of Federal aid and greater centralization of powers in Washington used the Sputnik scare to finally get an aid bill approved. It was based on the national defense, but I assure you it was national defense in name only.

For example, there is no requirement in the bill that those

students participating in the loan program, or in the grant program as originally considered, confine their studies to subjects related directly to national defense, nor is there a requirement that participating students utilize their training after graduation. As far as the act is concerned, a student may obtain funds to study flower arranging or automobile retailing.

Lest there be any doubt as to the generality of this Federal aid bill, one should notice that it has eight separate prongs including a student loan program, a grant program for the purchase of equipment and supplies, a national defense fellowship program, a guidance, counseling and testing program, a foreign language institute program, a program for training teachers of foreign languages, a program for research and experimentation in teaching by communication media, and a new vocational program for technicians. Although no need was shown for this program in the extensive hearings that were held, the bill was enacted in spite of the fact that government interference under the guise of assistance is certain to act as a control agent and a sap of the initiative of our young citizens. Unfortunately, it is a major step toward collectivism.

Also, as I stated on the Senate Floor upon consideration of the conference report on the Aid To Education Bill, this bill gives the Federal Government another financial sanction against segregation, for the government can refuse by administrative order to allow segregated schools to participate.

I will mention but one more example of the course which many in Congress would set for the Nation. This is the Omnibus Housing Bill which was passed by the Senate but was never reported by the House Banking Committee, despite frantic efforts on the part of its proponents. The bill would have authorized a six-year program of 2.1 billion dollars for urban renewal.

Urban renewal is a program whereby large areas are re-zoned, acquired by a government agency through eminent domain, destroyed, and rebuilt according to a pre-conceived federally-approved plan. Although less than 18,000 units of the 70,000 additional units of public housing authorized by Congress in 1956 were under contract by July 1, 1958, the Omnibus Housing Bill proposed an authorization for an additional 35,000 units.

In addition, the bill authorized and, in fact, directed a scheme for stepping up the progress of integration in housing units. This scheme was well camouflaged, but after discovering it and bringing it to the attention of all Southern Senators, I successfully amended the bill striking this provision from the Senate bill.

Incidentally, the public housing feature of this bill also contained a provision for the release of approximately \$8,330,000 per year of federal subsidy money to be used by local housing authorities for "social and recreational guidance." The hearings revealed that this fund was requested to finance an educational program to overcome prejudices which prevent harmonious relations in public housing units. Included also in the bill was an authorization for a quarter of a billion dollars for the construction of college classrooms,

laboratories, and related facilities. There were additional features in this bill which would have cost approximately \$200 million.

The drive in the direction of socialism is emphasized by the Omnibus Housing Bill in view of the fact that early in the second session of the 85th Congress an Emergency Housing Act covering almost all housing deficiencies was passed.

The complexion of the Congress is as well illustrated by the legislation which was rejected as by that which was favorably considered. Exemplifying the rejection of sound legislation was the Senate defeat of the bill limiting federal pre-emption, popularly known as the Smith Bill, or H. R. 3.

This bill passed the House by a substantial majority but was bottled up in committee in the Senate. In the closing days of the session it was presented to the Senate in the form of an amendment. The opposition, after extended debate, moved to table the amendment, but the motion to table was defeated by a vote of 46 to 39. This preliminary vote, to me, was the most encouraging show of strength made by the conservative thinking Senators during the 85th Congress.

This sound and worthwhile legislation provided that no congressional act should be construed to pre-empt the field and thereby nullify State laws on the subject unless either: First, the acts specifically so provided; or second, there was an irreconcilable conflict between the Federal act and State law. It also provided that no Federal anti-sedition act should prevent enforcement in State courts of State statutes providing a criminal penalty for sedition against the United States or such State.

This provision was aimed specifically at the Supreme Court's decision in the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Nelson, in which the Court held that by virtue of the passage of the Smith Act, Congress showed an intent to nullify all State anti-sedition laws, even though the Smith Act itself specifically states a contrary intent.

I am sure you are aware of the determined and successful fight which the opponents of this measure waged in the Senate in the closing days of the session. Their opposition included the very real threat of a filibuster against the bill, despite the avowed intention of the same people to abolish forever extended debate by a change in the Senate Rules. It is interesting to note where our Northern Democrat colleagues stood on this vote. Voting for the Smith Bill Amendment in our 41-40 loss were 17 Democrats, all Southerners, but not all the Senators from Southern States, and 23 Republicans. Voting in favor of the court were 27 Democrats and 14 Republicans.

Other constructive legislation such as the Jenner-Butler Bill, designed to slow the march of a power-mad Supreme Court, was rejected by a vote of 49 to 41. The voting pattern on this bill was similar to the comparison just given.

It is obvious to those of us in the Congress who seek to insure adherence to constitutional provisions that the Congress has reached the stage where it almost inevitably bows to the dictates of determined left-wing and union elements, regardless of the good or bad effects of the pending legislation.

One of the most disturbing situations which confronts the public and, therefore, the Congress is in the field of labor-management relations.

The Select Committee on Labor-Management Relations, commonly known as the McClellan or Rackets Committee, has uncovered numerous incidences of racketeering and abuses in this field. These ominous disclosures indicate beyond question that our laws on the subject are inadequate to protect the public, and particularly, the rank and file working man from unscrupulous union leaders, employer consultants, and gangsters who have infiltrated the trade union movement. Senator McClellan, who has so ably presided at the long and exhaustive

hearings on the subject, has summarized the situation quite clearly in a recent statement on the Senate floor. I quote him briefly as follows:

The extent to which criminal, corrupt and disreputable elements have infiltrated and now dominate the labor movement in some areas is shocking to an alarming degree. The impositions on management and the public and the exploitation of union members in some labor organizations by arrogant and dishonest labor officials have reached proportions that violate all proper ethics and standards of decency, defy law and order and constitute a serious threat to free trade unionism and to our free enterprise system. Unless these vicious practices are stopped, there is a real danger ultimately of a racketeer, gangster-dominated economy in America. (end quote)

Although public sentiment aroused by the evidence revealed at these hearings forced the Congress to consider legislation in the labor-management relations field, Congress emphatically declined to act effectively in either house. The Kennedy-Ives bill, which was passed by the Senate, contained provisions which were a slight step in the right direction.

For instance, trusteeships were limited to 18 months duration under the terms of the bill. Union elections were required to be by secret ballots, and the maximum term of union officers was limited. The bill would also have prevented felons from holding union office until their civil rights had been restored by Executive pardon.

An amendment which I succeeded in having placed in the bill would have prohibited unions from collecting unloading fees from interstate truckers where no actual work was done and no contract existed.

Even in the Senate bill, however, many major areas of abuses were entirely overlooked, and some provisions were actually contained in the bill which would have worsened the situation rather than helped. As examples of the latter, the bill would have permitted replaced strikers to vote in representation elections which they are now barred from doing under the Taft-Hartley Act. As a matter of fact, this change would have reestablished the law as it existed under the Wagner Act.

Federal control under the terms of the bill would have been increased at the expense of State authority, since the bill provided that the National Labor Relations Board was required to assert jurisdiction over all cases covered by the Taft-Hartley Act. Another particularly undesirable feature was the provision which would have permitted pre-hire agreements between contractors and unions in building trades and made union membership mandatory in seven days rather than 30.

Among the areas which were ignored by the Kennedy-Ives Bill was that of secondary boycotts and organizational picketing. In the field of internal union affairs, there was no provision in the bill to insure the rank and file union members of a voice in such an important union decision as the terms of collectively bargained agreements, the questions of whether to strike, and the provisions of their constitution and bylaws, including the amount of dues and initiation fees.

In my opinion, one of the major deficiencies of the bill was its failure to limit, at least to some extent, the use of union dues by union leaders in conflict with the desires of the individual union members, since, as I will point out, these dues are used predominantly for purposes other than that of promoting collective bargaining.

The foregoing discussion naturally raises the question as to why the socialistic measures promoted by left-wing organizations and labor union leaders are preferred in Congress. Of course, there are many contributing factors, but I believe that there are two which predominate. The first major factor which is responsible for congressional socialism is the political ac-

tivity of labor unions, or to be more accurate, the political activities conducted by labor union leaders with the dues of rank and file members.

Not always are these funds spent directly. For instance, between the period 1951 to 1957 inclusive, the unions of this country contributed \$350,546.40 to an organization called the Americans for Democratic Action. Incidentally, this comprises about one-third of the ADA budget.

In order to determine exactly what this money was spent for, one can only look at the policies of the ADA. For example, some of the specific things that the ADA advocates are FEPC, the Brannan Plan, compulsory health insurance, Federal wage price and rent controls, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, power of the Federal Executive to modify tax rates to meet changing conditions, the abolition of the seniority rule in the United States Senate, the unilateral cessation by the United States of nuclear bomb tests, Federal aid to education, relief aid to Communist China, and recognition by the United Nations and the United States of Red China.

The unions maintain and finance their own newspapers. They employ their own radio news broadcasters. They utilize an organization called COPE, the Committee on Political Education, through which money is channeled for the election of candidates who support their views. They employ their organization in political efforts, and I think, as we all know, they do it quite effectively.

The unions have also made enormous contributions to the NAACP, an organization which has been doing the work of the Communists in stirring up racial unrest in this country at a time when our people should be united as never before against the menace of World Communism. If there is any doubt that the NAACP has been aiding and abetting the cause of the Communist Party of the USA, then I suggest a perusal of J. Edgar Hoover's best selling book, *Masters of Deceit*.

In his book, the FBI director points out that the number one goal of our domestic Communists is fomenting racial disturbances and arraying the white and Negro races against each other.

Walter Reuther, the union dictator who is exercising increasing influence over the National Democratic Party, admitted in recent McClellan Committee hearings that his UAW union had made contributions to the NAACP. In one specific instance he presented a check for \$75,000 to Arthur Spingarn, president of the NAACP and one of its 53 leaders who have been cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee as having been affiliated with subversive organizations or activities.

In addition, Mr. Reuther's AFL-CIO headquarters has distributed on a mass scale an "integration kit" prepared by the CIO's department of education and research. This kit contains, among other things, a story of the necessity of forced integration, including inflammatory pictures.

I have asked the United States Senate what business the unions have in giving away the dues of the working men and women of America to such Un-American organizations as the ADA, NAACP, and other such groups which contribute either directly or indirectly to the cause of the Communists. In reply, the Senate voted 51 to 30 to defeat an amendment to the Labor Reform Bill which would have restricted such expenditures by union leaders. Voting in favor of the amendment were just five Southerners and 25 Republicans.

This, then, is the first major factor in the leftward march of our legislators.

The second major factor is the influence exercised by minor-

ity groups through their balance of power between tradition-bound political party members. This influence is most spectacular in Presidential elections since the minorities are concentrated to a large extent in mass population centers of States having tremendously large electoral votes. These minorities profess to be able to turn the entirety of these large State electoral votes by the way they vote in blocs for whichever side bids higher for their votes.

The degree of success of the minority groups in elections is illustrated by the vigor with which they oppose an amendment to the electoral college system whereby their votes would only reflect their relative numerical strength. Although the minority vote is felt more strongly in the Presidential elections, it also carries a great deal of weight in Congressional elections.

Analytical criticism, while usually helpful, will not by itself erase Congressional preference for Socialism. There have been too few voices raised in criticism of the Congressional preference for Socialism, and, affirmative suggestions for coping with this dangerous trend have been altogether lacking. This is pointed up by the most recent prognostications of the political pollsters which report that the more radical candidates should win in almost every general election contest.

If this be true, there will be a larger force on hand in the Senate next January to assist the radicals in their promised assault on free and extended debate in the greatest deliberative body in the world.

I have offered the foregoing criticism with a constructive intent, and, I shall not leave you without my affirmative suggestions for remedying the situation.

The power to overcome the influences which I have mentioned lies solely with the individual citizens of this great country. There must be a reawakening on the part of all our people in their concern for individual liberty and freedom of initiative. This reawakening must then be translated into effective political action on the local, state, and national levels throughout the country. It can only be done by the renunciation of self-serving interest by the individual in favor of broad principles of constitutional government.

The individual citizen must inform himself on the issues at stake in elections at all levels. Then, he must be sure to register and vote his convictions. Just registering and voting as an individual, however, is not enough. Each person must do his best to insure that there is a good candidate on the ticket to support—one with sound views who is willing to place principle above partisan and other considerations. Once dedicated to a principle or a set of principles, then the individual citizen should remain steadfast, even when the tide is strongly against the principle he is supporting. It is never easy to stand alone, but principle sometimes requires that this be done. Taking a positive and strong stand in favor of principle in the face of adversity and personal denunciation is just as important for the individual citizen as it is for his representative in the halls of government.

In other words, each citizen must exert himself tirelessly in an effort to elect to office the candidate who has an open mind—a mind circumscribed only by a firm adherence to the Constitution as written. Experience proves that debate in the Congress, no matter how factual or persuasive, has little or no effect on minds that were closed on election day by commitments to pressure groups seeking special interest legislation and governmental action.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that the failure by our individual citizens to heed the trite, but true, phrase, "vigilance is the price of liberty," will surely result in slavery for us all.